arXiv:math/0503170v1 [math.CO] 8 Mar 2005

LOW RANK APPROXIMATIONS OF SYMMETRIC POLYNOMIALS AND ASYMPTOTIC COUNTING OF CONTINGENCY TABLES

Alexander Barvinok

March 2005

We represent the number of $m \times n$ non-negative integer matrices (contingency tables) with prescribed row sums and column sums as the expected value of the permanent of a non-negative random matrix with exponentially distributed entries. We bound the variance of the obtained estimator, from which it follows that if the row and column sums are bounded by a constant fixed in advance, we get a polynomial time approximation scheme for counting contingency tables. We show that the complete symmetric polynomial of a fixed degree in n variables can be ϵ-approximated coefficient-wise by a sum of powers of $O(\log n)$ linear forms, from which it follows that if the row sums (but not necessarily column sums) are bounded by a constant, there is a deterministic approximation algorithm of $m^{O(\log n)}$ complexity to compute the logarithmic asymptotic of the number of tables.

1. Introduction and main results

(1.1) Contingency tables. Contingency tables are non-negative integer matrices with prescribed row and column sums, called marginals. The problem of computing the number of contingency tables with given marginals has attracted a lot of attention recently, see [DG95], [D+97], [Mo02], [CD03]. The counting problem is motivated by applications to statistics, combinatorics, representation theory, and is interesting in its own right, cf. [DG95].

Let us consider non-negative integer $m \times n$ matrices with the row sums $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and the column sums $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ such that $r_1 + \ldots + r_m = c_1 + \ldots + c_n = N$. If the number m of rows and the number n of columns are fixed in advance, the number of such matrices can be computed in polynomial time (that is, in time polynomial in $\log N$) since the problem reduces to counting integer points in a polytope in fixed

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05A16, 68R05, 68W20, 15A15.

Key words and phrases. contingency tables, approximation algorithms, symmetric functions, rank.

This research was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 0400617.

Typeset by $\mathcal{AMS}$-TEX

dimension, see [Ba94]. In fact, one does not need to apply the counting algorithm in full generality since the polytope in question, the transportation polytope of non-negative matrices with prescribed row and column sums, is either totally unimodular, or a straightforward "combinatorial" degeneration of a totally unimodular polytope, a fact used in [DS03].

If one of the dimensions (for example, the number of columns) is allowed to grow, the exact counting becomes difficult. As is shown in [D+97], exact counting is $\#P$-hard already for $2 \times n$ matrices. The hardness result uses that the total sum N can become exponentially large in n (so that $\log N$ is polynomial in n). If the number m of rows is fixed, a dynamic programming based algorithm computes the number of tables in time polynomial in N, thus resulting in a pseudo-polynomial algorithm, cf. [CD03].

On the other hand, Dyer, Kannan, and Mount [D+97] have shown that if all the marginal r_i, c_j are not too small ($r_i = \Omega(n^2 m)$ and $c_j = \Omega(m^2 n)$), then the Monte Carlo based approach allows one to approximate the number of contingency tables within a prescribed relative error $\epsilon > 0$ in time polynomial in m, n and ϵ^{-1}. In this case, the number of tables is well approximated by the volume of the corresponding polytope. Subsequently, Morris improved the bounds to $r_i = \Omega(n^{3/2} m \log m)$ and $c_j = \Omega(m^{3/2} n \log n)$. Combining the dynamic programming approach with the volume approximation idea, Cryan and Dyer [CD03] obtained a randomized polynomial time approximation algorithm in the situation when the number of rows is fixed. This was later generalized in [C+04].

Thus the most difficult case is that with N "moderately large" with respect to m and n.

If both row sums r_i and column sums c_j are small, A. Békéssy, P. Békéssy, and Komlós [B+72] proved the asymptotic formula

$$\frac{N!}{r_1! \cdots r_m! c_1! \cdots c_n!} \exp\left\{ \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{i,j} \binom{r_i}{2} \binom{c_j}{2} \right\} \tag{1.1.1}$$

for the number of tables assuming that $N \longrightarrow +\infty$ while the marginals remain bounded by a constant, fixed in advance: $r_i, c_j \leq \rho$. In [B+72], the authors proved that the relative error of this approximation is $O\left(N^{-1/2} \log N\right)$ and conjectured that it is $O\left(N^{-1}\right)$. Essentially, formula (1.1.1) counts contingency tables with entries not exceeding 2.

Good and Crook [GC77] make a heuristic argument that the formula should be valid for contingency tables under more general conditions of $r_i c_j / N$ being small.

If $m = n$ and $r_i = c_j = 2$, an explicit generating function for the number of tables is known, see Corollary 5.5.11 of [St99], which leads to a pseudo-polynomial algorithm to compute the number of such tables exactly.

Suppose now that we count every table (d_{ij}) with weight

$$\prod_{ij} \frac{1}{d_{ij}!} \tag{1.1.2}$$

(the Fisher-Yates or the multiple hypergeometric statistics). In this case, the weighted number of tables with row sums $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and column sums $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ is exactly equal to

$$\frac{N!}{r_1! \cdots r_m! c_1! \cdots c_n!}. \tag{1.1.3}$$

(1.2) Symmetric polynomials. For a positive integer r, the *complete symmetric polynomial* h_r of degree r in n variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is the sum of all distinct monomials

$$\mathbf{x}^a = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n} \quad \text{where} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i = r \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_i \geq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

A well-known and easy to prove result states that the number of $m \times n$ contingency tables with row sums $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and column sums $c_1, \ldots, c_m$ is equal to the coefficient of the monomial $x_1^{c_1} \cdots x_n^{c_n}$ in the product

$$h_{r_1}(\mathbf{x}) \cdots h_{r_m}(\mathbf{x}), \tag{1.2.1}$$

see, for example, Proposition 7.5.1 of [St99]. Similarly, if e_r is an *elementary symmetric polynomial* of degree r in $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ (that is, the sum of all square-free monomials of degree r), then the coefficient of the monomial $x_1^{c_1} \cdots x_n^{c_n}$ in the product

$$e_{r_1}(\mathbf{x}) \cdots e_{r_m}(\mathbf{x})$$

is the number of 0-1 matrices with the row sums $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and the column sums $c_1, \ldots, c_n$, see Proposition 7.4.1 of [St99].

Let us "approximate" every polynomial h_r in the product (1.2.1) by the power $(x_1 + \ldots + x_n)^r$. The monomial expansion of the power contains all the same monomials $\mathbf{x}^a$ of degree r, only the coefficient of the monomial $x_1^{\alpha_1} \ldots x_n^{\alpha_n}$ is equal not to 1 but to $r!/\alpha_1! \cdots \alpha_n!$. Consequently, the coefficient of $x_1^{c_1} \cdots x_n^{c_n}$ in the product

$$(x_1 + \ldots + x_n)^{r_1} \cdots (x_1 + \ldots + x_n)^{r_m} = (x_1 + \cdots + x_n)^N, \quad \text{where} \quad N = r_1 + \ldots + r_m$$

is equal to $r_1! \cdots r_m!$ times the number of contingency tables with the row sums $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and the column sums $c_1, \ldots, c_n$, given that the weight of the table (d_{ij}) is the hypergeometric weight (1.1.2). On the other hand, this coefficient is equal to $N!/c_1! \cdots c_n!$, from which we deduce (1.1.3).

As follows from formula (1.1.1), the Fisher-Yates statistics provides a reasonably good approximation to the uniform measure on contingency tables if the row and column sums are small. However, if only the row sums r_i are small but column

sums c_j are allowed to be large (for example, if $m \gg n$), the approximation (1.1.1) is no longer valid.

In this paper, we present an algorithm for asymptotic computation of the number of contingency tables where the row sums r_i are small (and column sums c_j are allowed to be large). Namely, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and a positive integer ρ, fixed in advance, we present an algorithm, which, given positive integers $r_1, \ldots, r_m \le \rho$ and positive integers $c_1, \ldots, c_n$, approximates the number of contingency tables with row sums $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and column sums $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ within a factor of $(1-\epsilon)^N$, where $N = r_1 + \ldots + r_m = c_1 + \ldots + c_n$. The algorithm has a quasi-polynomial complexity of $m^{O(\log n)}$. We present the algorithm in Section 3. The algorithm is based on the observation that n-variate complete symmetric polynomials h_r for small (fixed) r can be approximated by polynomials of $O(\log n)$ *rank*. Namely, we prove the following result.

(1.3) Theorem. *Let us fix a positive integer r and an $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists a constant $\kappa = \kappa(r, \epsilon) > 0$ with the following properties. For any integer $n \ge 2$, there exist $k \le \kappa \ln n$ linear forms $\ell_i : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for the polynomial*

$$\tilde{h}_r = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ell_i^r(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \ge 0 \\ \alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_n = r}} \tilde{h}_{r,a} \mathbf{x}^a,$$

we have

$$(1-\epsilon)^r \le \tilde{h}_{r,a} \le (1+\epsilon)^r$$

for all non-negative integer vectors $a = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ with $\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_n = r$.

Moreover, we present a polynomial time algorithm to construct forms ℓ_i. Similar result holds for elementary symmetric functions e_r, which leads to a counting algorithm for 0-1 matrices.

(1.4) Theorem. *Let us fix a positive integer r and an $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists a constant $\kappa = \kappa(r, \epsilon) > 0$ with the following properties. For any integer $n \ge 2$, there exist $k \le \kappa \ln n$ linear forms $\ell_{ij} : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for the polynomial*

$$\tilde{e}_r = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \prod_{j=1}^{r} \ell_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\substack{I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_r\} \\ 1 \le i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_r \le n}} \tilde{e}_{r,I} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r},$$

we have

$$(1-\epsilon)^r \le \tilde{e}_{r,I} \le (1+\epsilon)^r$$

for all r-subsets $I \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

Let us fix a positive integer k. Let us "approximate" every polynomial h_r in the product (1.2.1) by a homogeneous polynomial of degree r that is a product of polynomials h_s with $s \le k$. Then the coefficients of $x_1^{c_1} \cdots x_n^{c_n}$ in the product (1.2.1) enumerates contingency tables with weights "interpolating" between the Fisher-Yates statistics for $k = 1$ and the uniform measure on tables for $k \ge \max\{r_1, \ldots, r_m\}$.

As a by-product of our approach we express the number of contingency tables as the expectation of the permanent of a random matrix. The *permanent* of an $N \times N$ matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ is expressed by the formula

$$\operatorname{per} A = \sum_{\sigma \in S_N} \prod_{i=1}^{N} a_{i\sigma(i)},$$

where σ ranges over the symmetric group S_N of all permutations of the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$. Recently, Jerrum, Sinclair, and Vigoda constructed a randomized polynomial time approximation scheme to compute the permanent of a given non-negative matrix [J+04]. As a corollary, they obtained a randomized polynomial time approximation scheme to count 0-1 matrices with prescribed row and column sums.

Recall that a random variable γ is *standard exponential* if

$$\mathbf{P}(\gamma \geq t) = \begin{cases} e^{-t} & \text{for } t \geq 0 \\ 1 & \text{for } t < 0. \end{cases}$$

We obtain the following result.

(1.5) Theorem. *Given positive integers $r_1, \dots, r_m$ and $c_1, \dots, c_n$ such that $r_1 + \dots + r_m = c_1 + \dots + c_n = N$, let us consider the $N \times N$ random matrix A constructed as follows. We represent the set of rows of A as a disjoint union of m subsets $R_1, \dots, R_m$, where $|R_i| = r_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and the set of columns of A as a disjoint union of n subsets $C_1, \dots, C_n$, where $|C_j| = c_j$. Thus A is split into mn blocks $R_i \times C_j$. We sample mn independent standard exponential random variables γ_{ij}, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ and fill the entries of the block $R_i \times C_j$ by the copies of γ_{ij}. Let $\alpha = \operatorname{per} A$, so α is a function of the random variables γ_{ij}.*

Then

(1) *The number of $m \times n$ contingency tables with the row sums $r_1, \dots, r_m$ and column sums $c_1, \dots, c_n$ is equal to*

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}\alpha}{r_1! \cdots r_m! c_1! \cdots c_n!};$$

(2) *We have*

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}\alpha^2}{\mathbf{E}^2\alpha} \leq 2^{2N};$$

(3) *Suppose that $r_i, c_j \leq \rho$ for some number ρ and all i, j. Then there exists a constant $\kappa = \kappa(\rho)$, such that*

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}\alpha^2}{\mathbf{E}^2\alpha} \leq \kappa.$$

One can choose $\kappa(\rho) = \exp\Big\{\rho^2(2\rho)!\Big\}$.

We prove Theorem 1.5 in Section 4. Let us fix a number $0 < p < 1$, for example $p = 2/3$. As follows by the Chebyshev inequality, if the row and column sums are bounded in advance, the average of $O(\epsilon^{-2})$ permanents of randomly generated $N \times N$ matrices, with probability at least p approximates the number of contingency tables within a relative error ϵ. In view of [J+04], we obtain a polynomial time approximation algorithm for counting contingency tables when the row and column sums are bounded by a constant, fixed in advance.

(1.6) Counting with weights. A natural generalization of the counting problem is counting with multiplicative weights. Given an $m \times n$ matrix $W = (w_{ij})$ of weights, let us define the weight of an $m \times n$ non-negative integer matrix $D = (d_{ij})$ as

$$\prod_{ij} w_{ij}^{d_{ij}}.$$

For example, if $w_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ then the weight of D is 1 if and only if $d_{ij} > 0$ implies $w_{ij} = 1$. In this case, weighted counting implies counting matrices with allowed entries (i, j) for which $w_{ij} = 1$. Our results for asymptotic counting of contingency tables with small row sums admit generalization to counting with weights, provided the rank of the weight matrix W is fixed. Similarly, Theorem 1.5 admits a straightforward generalization for counting with weights: the γ_{ij} entry of matrix A needs to be multiplied by w_{ij}. Part (2) also remains valid, although Part (3) does not. Finally, we note that the weighted modification of the Fisher-Yates statistics can be easily expressed as a permanent.

(1.7) Theorem. *Given positive integers $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ such that $r_1 + \ldots + r_m = c_1 + \ldots + c_n = N$, and a non-negative $m \times n$ matrix $W = (w_{ij})$, let us consider the $N \times N$ matrix A constructed as follows. We represent the set of rows of A as a disjoint union of m subsets $R_1, \ldots, R_m$, where $|R_i| = r_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and the set of columns of A as a disjoint union of n subsets $C_1, \ldots, C_n$, where $|C_j| = c_j$. Thus A is split into mn blocks $R_i \times C_j$. Let us fill the entries of the block $C_i \times R_j$ by w_{ij}. Then the total weight of $m \times n$ contingency tables with the row sums $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and column sums $c_1, \ldots, c_n$, where the table $D = (d_{ij})$ is counted with the weight*

$$\prod_{ij} \frac{w_{ij}^{d_{ij}}}{d_{ij}!},$$

is equal to

$$\frac{\operatorname{per} A}{r_1! \cdots r_m! c_1! \cdots c_n!}.$$

We prove Theorem 1.7 in Section 4.

2. Preliminaries: a scalar product in the space of polynomials

We will use a certain scalar product in the space V_n of real n-variate polynomials. There are many ways to define it. The most straightforward way is to define the

scalar product of two monomials

$$\langle \mathbf{x}^a, \mathbf{x}^b \rangle = \begin{cases} \alpha_1! \cdots \alpha_n! & \text{if } a = b = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A more formal way is to write

$$\langle f, g \rangle = f(\partial) g(\mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=(0,\ldots,0),}$$

where $f(\partial)$ is the differential operator

$$f(\partial) = f\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n} \right).$$

The most invariant way is to consider the complex space $\mathbb{C}^n$, the Gaussian measure ν_n there with the density

$$\frac{1}{\pi^n} e^{-\|z\|^2} \quad \text{where} \quad \|z\|^2 = |\zeta_1|^2 + \ldots + |\zeta_n|^2 \quad \text{for} \quad z = (\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n),$$

and let

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{C}^n} f(z) \overline{g(z)} \, d\nu_n.$$

From this representation or otherwise, cf. [Ba96], it follows that the scalar product is invariant under orthogonal transformations of the coordinates: if U is an orthogonal transformation of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and f_1 and g_1 are defined by $f_1(x) = f(Ux)$ and $g_1(x) = g(Ux)$ respectively, then $\langle f, g \rangle = \langle f_1, g_1 \rangle$. Equivalently, for a linear transformation $A : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, let us define the polynomial Af by

$$Af(\mathbf{x}) = f(A^* \mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where A^* is the conjugate transformation. Then

$$\langle Af, g \rangle = \langle f, A^* g \rangle.$$

The importance of this scalar product for us is that we can express the coefficient of $\mathbf{x}^a$ in f as the scalar product

$$\frac{\langle f, \mathbf{x}^a \rangle}{\alpha_1! \cdots \alpha_n!}.$$

(2.1) Complexity of computing the scalar product. Suppose that f and g are n-variate homogeneous polynomials of degree k given by their monomial expansions

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_a f_a \mathbf{x}^a \quad \text{and} \quad g(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_a g_a \mathbf{x}^a.$$

Then, to compute $\langle f, g\rangle$ one needs to sum up at most $\binom{n+k-1}{k}$ terms:

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \sum_{a=(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n)} \alpha_1!\cdots\alpha_n! f_\alpha g_a$$

Taking into account computation of factorials, one can compute the scalar product using $O\left(k\binom{n+k-1}{k}\right)$ arithmetic operations. In particular, if the number of variables n is fixed, we get a polynomial time algorithm. We will also be interested in the case of $n = O(\log k)$, in which case we get an algorithm of a quasipolynomial $k^{O(\log k)}$ complexity.

Generally, if the polynomials f and g are defined by their "black boxes", which, for any given $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ compute the values $f(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{x})$, we can obtain the monomial expansions of $f(\mathbf{x})$ and $g(\mathbf{x})$ via the standard procedure of interpolation in $O\left(\binom{n+k-1}{k}^3\right)$ time (provided n and k are known in advance), cf. [KY91] for the sparse version. Again, if n is fixed, we get a polynomial time algorithm and if $n = O(\log k)$, we get an algorithm of a quasipolynomial complexity.

The invariance of the scalar product under the action of the orthogonal group often allows us to reduce the number of variables.

(2.2) The rank of a polynomial. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial. We say that $\operatorname{rank} f \leq r$ if there are r linear forms $\ell_i : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$ and a polynomial $q : \mathbb{R}^r \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = q\left(\ell_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \ell_r(\mathbf{x})\right) \quad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

Suppose we want to compute the scalar product $\langle f, g\rangle$, where $\operatorname{rank} f \leq r$ and f is represented as a polynomial q in linear forms $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r$. Let $e_1, \dots, e_r$ be the coordinate linear forms

$$e_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \dots, r.$$

Let A be a linear transformation such that $Ae_i = \ell_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Then

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \langle q\left(Ae_1, \dots, Ae_r\right), g\rangle = \langle Aq(e_1, \dots, e_r), g\rangle = \langle q(e_1, \dots, e_r), A^* g\rangle.$$

Now we observe that $q(e_1, \dots, e_r)$ is a polynomial in the first r variables $x_1, \dots, x_r$. Replacing A^*g by the "truncated" polynomial $\hat{g}$ obtained from A^*g by setting

$x_{r+1} = \ldots = x_n = 0$, we reduce computation of $\langle f, g\rangle$ to computation of the scalar product of two r-variate polynomials

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \langle q, \hat{g}\rangle.$$

In practical terms, if the linear forms ℓ_i are defined by

$$\ell_i(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha_{i1}x_1 + \ldots + \alpha_{in}x_n,$$

we fill the $n \times n$ matrix $A^* = (a_{ij})$ by letting $a_{ij} = \alpha_{ij}$ for $i \le r$ and arbitrarily for larger i. Then we transpose A^* to get A and compute $\hat{g}(x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ by substituting $x_{r+1} = \ldots = x_n = 0$ into $g(A\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{x}$ is interpreted as the n-column of variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$.

We will also need the following result, which can be considered as a complex version of the Wick formula, see for example, [Zv97]. Since the author was unable to locate it in the literature, we present its proof here.

(2.3) Lemma. *Let $f_i, g_i : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$ be linear forms and let $F = f_1 \cdots f_m$ and $G = g_1 \cdots g_m$ be their products. Let us define an $m \times m$ matrix $B = (b_{ij})$ by $b_{ij} = \langle f_i, g_j\rangle$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, m$. Then*

$$\langle F, G\rangle = \operatorname{per} B.$$

Proof. First, we establish the formula in the particular case when $g_1 = \ldots = g_m = e_1$, the 1st coordinate linear form. In this case $G = x_1^m$, so letting $u = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)$, we can write

$$\langle F, G\rangle = m!F(u) = m!f_1(u) \cdots f_m(u).$$

On the other hand, $b_{ij} = f_i(u)$, so

$$\operatorname{per} B = m!f_1(u) \cdots f_m(u).$$

Next, we establish the formula when $g_1 = \ldots = g_m$. In this case, we can write $g_i = Ae_1$ for some linear transformation A of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Hence

$$\langle F, G\rangle = \langle F, (Ae_1)^m\rangle = \langle A^*F, e_1^m\rangle = \langle (A^*f_1) \cdots (A^*f_m), e_1^m\rangle.$$

Then A^*f_i are linear forms and as we already established, the scalar product is equal to the permanent of the matrix with the entries

$$\langle A^*f_i, e_1\rangle = \langle f_i, Ae_1\rangle = \langle f_i, g_j\rangle = b_{ij}.$$

Finally, we establish the general case of the formula. Let us fix the forms $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ and consider both $\langle F, G\rangle$ and $\operatorname{per} B$ as functions of the forms $g_1, \ldots, g_m$. We observe that both $\langle F, G\rangle$ and $\operatorname{per} B$ are multilinear and symmetric in $g_1, \ldots, g_m$. Hence we obtain the general case by polarization. Namely, let us fix $g_1, \ldots, g_m$. For real variables $t = (\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_m)$, let us define the linear form $g_t = \tau_1 g_1 + \ldots + \tau_m g_m$. Let $G_t = g_t^m$ and let $B(t)$ be defined by $b_{ij}(t) = \langle f_i, g_t\rangle$. Then both $\langle F, G_t\rangle$ and $\operatorname{per} B(t)$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree m in $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_m$. Moreover, since both $\langle F, G\rangle$ and $\operatorname{per} B$ are multilinear and symmetric in $g_1, \ldots, g_m$, the coefficient of $\tau_1 \cdots \tau_m$ in $\langle F, G_t\rangle$ is equal to $m!\langle F, G\rangle$ while the coefficient of $\tau_1 \cdots \tau_m$ in $\operatorname{per} B(t)$ is equal to $m! \operatorname{per} B$. Since we already proved that $\langle F, G_t\rangle = \operatorname{per} B(t)$, the result follows. $\square$

3. Low rank approximations of symmetric polynomials

Let γ be a random variable with the standard exponential distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(\gamma > \tau) = \begin{cases} e^{-\tau} & \text{for } \tau \geq 0 \\ 1 & \text{for } \tau < 0. \end{cases}$$

Hence for all integer $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}\gamma^{\alpha} = \alpha!.$$

We will use the following straightforward result.

(3.1) Lemma. *Let $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n$ be independent random variables having the standard exponential distribution. Then, for any $r \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbf{E}(\gamma_1 x_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n x_n)^r = r! h_r(x_1, \ldots, x_n),$$

the complete symmetric polynomial of degree r.

Proof. We have

$$(\gamma_1 x_1 + \ldots + \gamma_n x_n)^r = \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \geq 0 \\ \alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_n = r}} \frac{r!}{\alpha_1! \cdots \alpha_n!} \gamma_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots \gamma_n^{\alpha_n} x_1^{\alpha_1} \ldots x_n^{\alpha_n}.$$

Since $\mathbf{E}\gamma_i^{\alpha_i} = \alpha_i!$, the proof follows. □

In what follows, $\kappa = \kappa(r, \epsilon)$ may denote various constants depending on r and ϵ only.

Given a "treshold" $\kappa > 0$, we define the truncated random exponential variable by

$$\overline{\gamma} = \begin{cases} \gamma & \text{if } \gamma \leq \kappa \\ 0 & \text{if } \gamma > \kappa, \end{cases}$$

where γ is the standard exponential random variable. The following is straightforward.

(3.2) Lemma. *Given r and $\delta > 0$, there exists a constant $\kappa = \kappa(r, \delta)$ such that for the truncated random variable $\overline{\gamma}$, one has*

$$(1 - \delta)\alpha! \leq \mathbf{E}\overline{\gamma}^{\alpha} \leq \alpha! \quad \textit{for} \quad \alpha = 0, \ldots, r.$$

□

Simple estimates show that one can choose

$$\kappa = O\left(r \ln r + \ln \frac{1}{\delta}\right).$$

Next, we are going to use a concentration inequality (Azuma's inequality) for the sum of independent bounded random variables, see, for example, Theorem A.16 of [AS92].

(3.3) Proposition. *Let $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m$ be independent random variables such that $\mathbf{E}\xi_i = \beta$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and $|\xi_i - \beta| \leq \kappa$ for some constant κ. Then, for all $\delta > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\Big\{\Big|\frac{\xi_1 + \ldots + \xi_m}{m} - \beta\Big| > \delta\Big\} \leq 2e^{-m\delta^2/2\kappa^2}.$$

An important consequence of Proposition 3.3 is that for δ, κ, and r fixed, we can make the bound $2e^{-m\delta^2/2\kappa^2}$ less than n^{-r} by choosing $m = O(\log n)$.

Now we can prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We choose a $\delta > 0$ so that $(1 - \delta) \geq (1 - \epsilon)^{1/2}$ and a threshold $\kappa = \kappa(r, \delta)$ so as to satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.2. Then we sample the coefficients of the linear forms $\ell_i : \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \ldots, m$ independently at random from the truncated standard exponential distribution. Let

$$\tilde{h}_r = \frac{1}{r!m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \ell_i^r.$$

Then, each coefficient $\tilde{h}_{r,a}$ of the monomial $\mathbf{x}^a$ is the average of m independent random samples of the random variable

$$\xi_a = \frac{\overline{\gamma_1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots \overline{\gamma_n}^{\alpha_n}}{\alpha_1! \cdots \alpha_n!}.$$

Since r is fixed, all random variables ξ_a remain uniformly bounded by some constant depending on r and ϵ only. Moreover, $(1-\epsilon)^{r/2} \leq \mathbf{E}\xi_a \leq 1$. Since for a fixed r, the number of $\binom{n+r-1}{r}$ of monomials $\mathbf{x}^a$ of multidegree a is bounded by a polynomial in n, by Proposition 3.3 we can choose $m = O(\log n)$ so that for each a, the probability that the average of ξ_a does not lie within the interval $[(1-\epsilon)^r, (1+\epsilon)^r]$ does not exceed $\left(3\binom{n+r-1}{r}\right)^{-1}$. Then, with probability at least $2/3$, the average $\tilde{h}_r$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.3. □

We sketch the proof of Theorem 1.4 below.

Sketch of proof of Theorem 1.4. With a surjective map $\omega : \{1, \ldots, n\} \longrightarrow \{1, \ldots, r\}$ we associate a homogeneous polynomial p_ω of degree r in n variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, which is the product of r linear forms in $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$:

$$p_\omega(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{\substack{j \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \\ \omega(j) = i}} x_j.$$

If ω is sampled from the uniform distribution on the space of all surjective maps $\{1, \ldots, n\} \longrightarrow \{1, \ldots, r\}$ then the expectation $\mathbf{E}p_\omega$ is a positive multiple of the elementary symmetric polynomial $e_k(\mathbf{x})$. Now we approximate $\mathbf{E}p_\omega$ by a sample average of $O(\log n)$ polynomials p_ω. To sample ω, it suffices to sample $\omega(i)$ independently for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and accept the resulting map if it is surjective. The map fails to be surjective with probability at most $r(1 - 1/r)^n$, which is negligible if r is fixed and n grows. □

(3.4) Derandomization. Proofs of Theorem 1.3 and 1.4 allow us to construct polynomials $\tilde{h}_r$ and $\tilde{e}_r$ by averaging $O(\log n)$ polynomials that are built from linear functions with independent random coefficients. A closer look reveals that the coefficients do not have to be independent, but only r-wise independent (that is, every r coefficients should be independent). If r is fixed in advance, one can use constructions of small (polynomial size) sample spaces to simulate such random variables, cf. Section 2 of Chapter 15 of [AS92] and [E+98]. This leads to polynomial time deterministic algorithms for construction of polynomials $\tilde{h}_r$ and $\tilde{e}_r$ in Theorems 1.3 and 1.4.

(3.5) Asymptotic counting of contingency tables. Now we can come up with an algorithm for asymptotic counting of tables. Let us fix an $\epsilon > 0$ and a positive integer ρ. Suppose that $r_1, \dots, r_m \le \rho$. We construct polynomials $\tilde{h}_r$ as in Theorem 1.3. The coefficient of $x^{c_1} \cdots x_n^{c_n}$ in the product

$$H(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{h}_{r_1} \cdots \tilde{h}_{r_m}$$

up to a factor of $(1-\epsilon)^N$ is equal to the number of contingency tables with the row sums $r_1, \dots, r_m$ and the column sums $c_1, \dots, c_n$. Theorem 1.3 implies that the rank of H is $O(\log n)$. Hence, applying the algorithm of Section 2.2, we compute the required coefficient in $m^{O(\log n)}$ time.

This construction allows some extensions and ramifications.

First, it extends to counting with weights (cf. Section 1.6) provided the rank of the weight matrix $W = (w_{ij})$ is fixed in advance. To this end, we approximate the polynomial $h_{r_i}(w_{i1}x_1, \dots, w_{in}x_n)$ by the sample average of $O(\log n)$ powers of linear forms $\ell_i^{r_i}(\mathbf{x})$ for $\ell_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij}\gamma_{ij}x_j$, where γ_{ij} are independent exponential random variables. If $\operatorname{rank} W$ is fixed in advance, the forms used in the approximation of h_{r_i} span a subspace of $O(\log n)$ dimension.

Second, we can compute approximately various other expressions of the type $\langle Q(\mathbf{x}), H(\mathbf{x})\rangle$. For example, let $C_k \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$ be subsets of integers and let

$$Q(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{c \in I_k} \frac{x_k^c}{c!}.$$

Then, up to a factor of $(1-\epsilon)^N$, the value of $\langle Q(\mathbf{x}), H(\mathbf{x})\rangle$ is equal to the number of contingency tables with the row sums $r_1, \dots, r_m$ and all possible column sums $c_1, \dots, c_n$ such that $c_k \in C_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$.

Finally, using Theorem 1.4 instead of Theorem 1.3 we obtain asymptotic enumeration algorithms for 0-1 matrices.

4. The estimator for the number of tables

In this Section, we prove Theorems 1.5 and 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let us define an n-variate polynomial

$$H(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} h_{r_i}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n),$$

where $h_r(\mathbf{x})$ is the complete symmetric polynomial of degree r. Then the number of contingency tables with the row sums $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and column sums $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ is equal to the coefficient of $\mathbf{x}^C = x_1^{c_1} \cdots x_n^{c_n}$ in $H(\mathbf{x})$. Using the scalar product of Section 2, we can write this number as

$$\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}^C, H(\mathbf{x}) \rangle}{c_1! \cdots c_n!}.$$

Using Lemma 3.1, we express $H(\mathbf{x})$ as the expectation of a product of linear forms. Namely, we define random linear forms ℓ_i by

$$\ell_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \gamma_{ij} x_j,$$

where γ_{ij} are independent exponential random variables. Then, by Lemma 3.1,

$$H(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{r_1! \cdots r_m!} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{E}\ell_i^{r_i}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{r_1! \cdots r_m!} \mathbf{E} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \ell_i^{r_i}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Let us denote $L(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \ell_i^{r_i}(\mathbf{x})$. Hence the number of contingency tables can be written as

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}\langle L(\mathbf{x}),\ \mathbf{x}^C \rangle}{c_1! \cdots c_n! r_1! \cdots r_m!}.$$

Since both $L(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{x}^C$ are products of linear forms, by Lemma 2.3 their scalar product evaluates by the permanent of the matrix of pairwise scalar products of linear forms $\ell_i(\mathbf{x})$ and $e_j(\mathbf{x}) = x_j$, which is the matrix A. This proves Part (1) of the theorem.

Let S_N be the symmetric group of all permutations of the set $\{1, \ldots, N\}$. Denoting the entries of A by a_{ij}, we get

$$\alpha = \sum_{\sigma \in S_N} \prod_{i=1}^{N} a_{i\sigma(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha^2 = \sum_{\phi, \psi \in S_N} \prod_{i=1}^{N} a_{i\phi(i)} a_{i\psi(i)}.$$

Therefore,

$$(\mathbf{E}\alpha)^2 = \sum_{\phi, \psi \in S_N} \left(\mathbf{E} \prod_{i=1}^{N} a_{i\phi(i)} \right) \left(\mathbf{E} \prod_{i=1}^{N} a_{i\psi(i)} \right) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathbf{E}\alpha^2 = \sum_{\phi, \psi \in S_N} \mathbf{E} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{N} a_{i\phi(i)} a_{i\psi(i)} \right).$$

Hence we represented $\mathbf{E}^2\alpha$ and $\mathbf{E}\alpha^2$ as a sum of $(N!)^2$ terms parameterized by pairs of permutations (ϕ, ψ).

To prove Part (2), we show that every term in the expansion of $\mathbf{E}^2\alpha$ is at most 2^{2N} times the corresponding term in the expansion of $\mathbf{E}\alpha^2$. Indeed, each term in the expansion of $\mathbf{E}^2\alpha$ is the product of the type

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\prod_{ij}\gamma_{ij}^{u_{ij}}\right)\mathbf{E}\left(\prod_{ij}\gamma_{ij}^{v_{ij}}\right) = \left(\prod_{ij}u_{ij}!\right)\left(\prod_{ij}v_{ij}!\right),$$

where u_{ij} and v_{ij} are non-negative integers such that

$$\sum_{ij}u_{ij} = \sum_{ij}v_{ij} = N.$$

The corresponding term in the expansion of $\mathbf{E}\alpha^2$ is

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\prod_{ij}\gamma_{ij}^{u_{ij}+v_{ij}}\right) = \prod_{ij}(u_{ij}+v_{ij})!.$$

Hence the ratio is

$$\prod_{ij}\frac{(u_{ij}+v_{ij})!}{u_{ij}!v_{ij}!} \le \prod_{ij}2^{u_{ij}+v_{ij}} = 2^{2N},$$

which proves Part (2).

To prove Part (3), we notice that $\mathbf{E}\alpha \ge N!$, since the expectation of every term is at least 1. Let us consider a particular term

$$t_{\phi\psi} = \prod_{i=1}^{N}a_{i\phi(i)}a_{j\psi(j)}.$$

We have $\mathbf{E}t_{\phi\psi} > 1$ if and only if some of the entries a_{ij} in the product belong to the same block $R_i \times C_j$. On the other hand, the maximum number of entries a_{ij} which belong to the same block does not exceed 2ρ. Therefore, if the number of blocks with more than one entry is k,

$$\mathbf{E}t_{\phi\psi} \le \left((2\rho)!\right)^k.$$

Let us bound the number of terms $t_{\phi\psi}$ with k entries belonging to the same block. We can choose a permutation $\phi \in S_N$ in $N!$ ways and a subset $I \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ of k indices in $\binom{N}{k}$ ways. For each entry $a_{i\phi(i)}$ with $i \in I$ we identify the block where $a_{i\phi(i)}$ belongs. Hence we get k or fewer blocks since some of them may coincide. Now, for each $i \in I$ there are at most ρ choices of $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and at most ρ

choices of $\psi(j)$ such that $a_{i\phi(i)}$ and $a_{j\psi(j)}$ belong to the same block as $\phi(i)$. After that, there are $(N-k)!$ choices for $\psi(i)$ for $i \notin I$. Hence

$$\mathbf{E}\alpha^2 \le \sum_{k=0}^{N} \frac{(N!)^2\rho^{2k}}{k!}\left((2\rho)!\right)^{2k} \le (N!)^2 \exp\Big\{\rho^2(2\rho)!\Big\},$$

from which the proof of Part (3) follows. □

The bound in Part (3) is probably non-optimal.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Let us define linear forms ℓ_i by

$$\ell_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij}x_i \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Let

$$L(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \ell_i(\mathbf{x}).$$

As follows from the discussion of Section 1.2, the number of weighted tables can be expressed as the coefficient of $\mathbf{x}^C = x_1^{c_1}\cdots x_n^{c_n}$ in the product $L(\mathbf{x})$ divided by $r_1!\cdots r_m!$. Using the scalar product of Section 2, we write the number of weighted tables as

$$\frac{\langle L(\mathbf{x}),\ \mathbf{x}^C\rangle}{c_1!\cdots c_n! r_1!\cdots r_m!}.$$

Since both $L(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{x}^C$ are products of linear forms, by Lemma 2.3 their scalar product evaluates by the permanent of the matrix of pairwise scalar products of linear forms $\ell_i(\mathbf{x})$ and $e_j(\mathbf{x}) = x_j$, which is the matrix A. □

References

[AS92] N. Alon and J.H. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method. With an appendix by Paul Erdös*, Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1992.

[Ba94] A. Barvinok, *A polynomial time algorithm for counting integral points in polyhedra when the dimension is fixed*, Math. Oper. Res. **19** (1994), 769–779.

[Ba96] A. Barvinok, *Two algorithmic results for the traveling salesman problem*, Math. Oper. Res. **21** (1996), 65–84.

[B+72] A. Békéssy, P. Békéssy, and J. Komlós, *Asymptotic enumeration of regular matrices*, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. **7** (1972), 343–353.

[CD03] M. Cryan and M. Dyer, *A polynomial-time algorithm to approximately count contingency tables when the number of rows is constant. Special issue on STOC 2002 (Montreal, QC)*, J. Comput. System Sci. **67** (2003), 291–310.

[C+04] M. Cryan, M. Dyer, and D. Randall, *Approximately counting integral flows and cell-bounded contingency tables*, preprint (2004).

[DG95] P. Diaconis and A. Gangolli, *Rectangular arrays with fixed margins*, IMA Vol. Math. Appl., Discrete Probability and Algorithms (Minneapolis, MN, 1993), vol. 72, Springer, New York, 1995, pp. 15–41.

[DS03] J. De Loera and B. Sturmfels, *Algebraic unimodular counting. Algebraic and geometric methods in discrete optimization*, Math. Program., Ser. B **96** (2003), 183–203.

[D+97] M. Dyer, R. Kannan, and J. Mount, *Sampling contingency tables*, Random Structures Algorithms **10** (1997), 487–506.

[E+98] G. Even, O. Goldreich, M. Luby, N. Nisan, and B. Veličković, *Efficient approximation of product distributions*, Random Structures & Algorithms **13** (1998), 1–16.

[GC77] I.J. Good and J.F. Crook, *The enumeration of arrays and a generalization related to contingency tables*, Discrete Math. **19** (1977), 23–45.

[J+04] M. Jerrum, A. Sinclair, and E. Vigoda, *A polynomial-time approximation algorithm for the permanent of a matrix with non-negative entries*, Journal of the ACM **51** (2004), 671–697.

[KY91] E. Kaltofen and L. Yagati, *Improved sparse multivariate polynomial interpolation algorithms*, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Symbolic and algebraic computation (Rome, 1988), vol. 358, Springer, Berlin, 1989, pp. 467–474.

[Mo02] B. Morris, *Improved bounds for sampling contingency tables*, Random Structures Algorithms **21** (2002), 135–146.

[St99] R.P. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics. Vol. 2*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 62, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[Zv97] A. Zvonkin, *Matrix integrals and map enumeration: an accessible introduction*, Combinatorics and physics (Marseilles, 1995), Math. Comput. Modelling **26** (1997), 281–304.

Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1109, USA

E-mail address: barvinok@umich.edu